

Response dated December 1, 2005
Office Action dated July 27, 2005

Application No. 09/725,122

REMARKS

The Final Office Action dated July 27, 2005 has been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered by the Applicants. In the Office Action, claims 1-23 and 28-43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,463 ("Godfrey") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,840 ("Barnett").

Telephone Interview of November 21, 2005

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for participating in the telephone interview of November 21, 2005. During the interview, the Applicants' representative discussed in some detail with the Examiner why the Applicants believe that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. Sect. 103(a) over Godfrey in view of Barnett is improper. The Applicants' representative also discussed why Applicants believe Godfrey does not disclose the claimed feature of a "plurality of devices having equal access to the group calendar." While the Examiner was not inclined to change his position on the current rejections during the interview, the Examiner expressed appreciation for the clarification of Applicants' arguments and indicated he would better be able to address the Applicants' response to the current Office Action. The Applicants' representative also discussed with the Examiner possible claim amendments to render the present claims patentable over the cited references. The Examiner indicated that if the claims were amended to further distinguish the "equal access" limitation over both Godfrey and Barnett, the claims would be allowable over the currently cited art.

Claim Amendments

To expedite prosecution of the application, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 17 and 21 to further distinguish the claims over Godfrey and Barnett, as discussed in the section below. In addition, the Applicants have also amended claims 3, 7, 16, 23, 28 and 40-43 and withdrawn claims 2, 31, 35, 39 and 43 to correct informalities in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects all currently pending claims under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Godfrey in view of Barnett.

As an initial matter, and as the Applicants have described in previous responses, the

Response dated December 1, 2005
Office Action dated July 27, 2005

Application No 09/725,122

Applicants respectfully submit that the Godfrey-Barnett combination is improper and fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there is no motivation to combine Godfrey and Barnett given that the systems disclosed in the two references are based on entirely different underlying architectures. Godfrey discloses a "push" architecture where updated calendar information is sent to a wireless device based on trigger events, whereas Barnett discloses an online calendaring system where wireline users can access group event calendars and manipulate the predefined events that appear in a group calendar. The Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to cite to any motivation in Godfrey or Barnett to make the combination, nor does the Office Action explain how the combination of such diverse systems would be successful. The Applicants have also described in previous responses why it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Godfrey and Barnett does not disclose all of the limitations of the present claims. Specifically, the Applicants have previously described why Godfrey at least fails to disclose the limitation of "equal access to the group calendar data," as cited in the Office Action of July 27, 2005. The "push" architecture of Godfrey does not allow for a group of wireless devices to have "equal access" to a group calendar. Instead, Godfrey discloses messages that are pushed under the control of redirection software based on trigger events.

However, in order to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, 17 and 21 as suggested during the Examiner interview of November 21, 2005 to further distinguish the claims over Godfrey and Barnett.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to state that the group calendar "comprises one or more calendar events created by at least one member of the group by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view" and that the "equal access" refers to "equal access to modify" the group calendar. The Applicants respectfully submit that neither Godfrey nor Barnett, either alone or in combination, disclose the amended claim features.

First, as the Office Action states, "Godfrey et al do not specifically mention that the wireless devices are operating in a group such that the calendar is a group calendar which each of the devices are able to modify." (Office Action dated July 27, 2005, pg. 2). In addition, Barnett does not disclose the amended features. Barnett discloses:

[an] online calendaring and purchasing system and method which allows a user to specify categories of events, to view events belonging to the specified categories from outside sources, and to add selected events from the outside sources to a personal calendar.

(Col. 2, lns. 52-56). Barnett is directed to an online calendar system where users can create

Response dated December 1, 2005
Office Action dated July 27, 2005

Application No. 09/725,122

calendars by selecting events (such as movies) from event categories provided by the calendaring system. While Barnett does disclose a group calendar which is modifiable by group members, Barnett does not disclose that calendar modifications are made by "entering calendar information into a new calendar event view," as disclosed by amended claim 1, and that every member of the group has "equal access to modify" the calendar events. In particular, according to the present invention:

New calendar events are created in a certain standard way (in a same and pre-defined way) from a service menu. The user of the terminal first selects a particular day and then a new calendar event view is shown in the display. A virtual keyboard is shown so that the new event can be typed and other information regarding its occurrence can also be determined. It is also possible to modify any event already in the agenda by clicking on that particular event.

(Specification, para. 43). Barnett does not describe "equal access" to all manually entered events for modification by any member of the group. In fact, Barnett only describes manual entry and modification of events for a personal calendar. While Barnett discloses that "users [] can contribute event information that they would like to share with other users [] in a particular group" (Col. 10, lns. 49-51), Barnett does not disclose that the members of the calendar group have "equal access to modify" such manually entered event information as in claim 1. For the aforementioned reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claim 1 render claim 1 patentable over Godfrey and Barnett.

Claims 12, 17 and 21 have also been amended to cite that "one or more calendar events [are] created by at least one member of the group by entering calendar information into a new calendar event view" and that each member of the group has "equal access to modify" the calendar information. Consequently, the Applicants also respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 12, 17 and 21 also render these claims patentable over Godfrey and Barnett.

Furthermore, because the remaining rejected claims 3-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38, and 40-42 each ultimately depend from allowable claims 1, 12, 17 and 21, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-11, 13-16, 18-20, 22-23, 28-30, 32-34, 36-38, and 40-42 are also allowable for at least the reasons cited above. Because the Applicants have withdrawn claims 2, 31, 35-39, and 43, the Applicants submit that the rejections with respect to these claims are rendered moot.

Response dated December 1, 2005
Office Action dated July 27, 2005

Application No. 09/725,122

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned should it be deemed necessary to facilitate prosecution of the application.

Date: December 1, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
By: Phoebe Phillips Bower
Phoebe Phillips Bower
Registration No. 56,431
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD
10 South Wacker Drive,
Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5000